

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/743,080	TOMOKUNI, ATSUSHI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Lakshmi S. Channavajjala	1615	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Lakshmi S. Channavajjala. (3) Mr. K. Niinaka.  
 (2) Richard Chin. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 30 May 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Counsel explained that the Brucks (2003/0103921) reference teaches a solidified product as opposed to a liquid composition and that the teachings of Brucks and Watanabe (teaches liquid) cannot be combined because of this reason. Discussed the results on pages 25 and 26 of the instant specification and it was emphasized that the claimed "isotropic liquid phase exhibiting bicontinuous structure" is a critical feature for the ability of the composition to clean oil as well as water make up. Discussed the possibility of applying the teachings of Watanabe alone or in combination with another reference. Applicants will submit the response to the outstanding action and the arguments will be considered in determining the patentability .